REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to describe a feature of one of the drawings consistent with the disclosure in the FIGs. and parent applications. Claims 1-13, 19, 22, and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

On pages 2-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) in view of Fitzpatrick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,757,735). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By way of review, Fitzpatrick et al. discloses a magneto-optical writing method in which a laser source 640 is driven to heat a magneto-optical medium 670 to allow a magnetic source to encode data on the medium 670. The laser source 640 is driven to generate pulses according to non-precomp and precomp values shown in Tables 1 and 2, where the determination of which table to use is performed by the pattern selector circuit 330. (Col. 1, lines 67-64, col. 7, lines 25-35, col. 9, lines 38-51). However, while described as being used to heat domains of a magneto optical medium to allow magnetic writing of data, Fitzpatrick et al. does not suggest that the laser source 640 actually performs the writing such that the pulses from the Tables 1 and 2 are not writing pulses.

Additionally, as discussed with the Examiner in the interview of November 9, 2006, the start point for the first pulse shown in Tables 1 and 2 is the same for each mark length for both the comp and precomp conditions: 0.5. There is no suggestion that the start point should be adjusted for the marks and/or according to the comp and precomp conditions. In contrast, claim 1 recites, among other features, "controlling the write pulse waveform based on a grouping table to generate an adaptive write pulse waveform by varying a position of a rising edge of the first pulse of a mark to be written according to a length of the mark to be written and/or a leading space, the grouping table storing rising edge data of the first pulse of the write pulse waveform varying according to corresponding stored values of lengths of marks to be written." As such, it is respectfully submitted that Fitzpatrick et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1.

For at least similar reasons it is respectfully submitted that Fitzpatrick et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 3 and 4.

Additionally, while Fitzpatrick et al. shows Tables 1 and 2 showing laser codes for

different mark lengths for corresponding comp and precomp conditions, as discussed with the Examiner in the interview, Fitzpatrick et al. does not suggest a single table having such codes, that the codes are grouped in one table according to different combinations of mark lengths and space lengths, or that any such table organizes codes according to combinations of the mark and space lengths being within predetermined values. In contrast, claim 2 recites, among other features, that "the grouping table stores the rising edge data of the first pulse for the write pulse waveform according to corresponding stored values of lengths of marks to be written and the leading space grouped according to a first preset length of the mark and space and a second preset length of the mark and space." As such, it is respectfully submitted that Fitzpatrick et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 2.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Fitzpatrick et al. also does not suggest "the grouping table having rising edge data grouped in pulse groups which group the first pulse of the write pulse waveform grouped according to a first preset length of the mark and space and a second preset length of the mark and space" as recited in claim 3, or the invention recited in claims 15, 17, and 18.

Claims 5-14 and 16 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from corresponding claims 1, 3, and 4.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

On pages 8-9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 19-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)in view of Fitzpatrick et al. and Winarski (U.S. Patent 6,115,339). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As similarly discussed with the Examiner in the interview, Winarski is not relied upon and does not cure the above noted deficiency of Fitzpatrick et al. as applied to claims 1, 3, and 4, from which claims 19-27 correspondingly depend. Additionally, while the Examiner cites to a portion of Winarski describing recording layers having phase change materials or magneto optical materials, it is noted that the cited sentence does not specifically state that magneto optical materials are actually DVD-RAM compliant. Moreover, it is noted that one skilled in the art would not so understand magneto optical materials as being included in the DVD-RAM standard. For instance, it is noted that the Standard ECMA-330 120 mm (4,7 Gbytes per side) and 80 mm (1,46 Gbytes per side) DVD Rewritable Disk (DVD-RAM) 3rd edition (June 2005) describes the DVD-RAM in terms of phase change recording as opposed to magneto optical recording. Thus, one skilled in the art would not interpret the reference to magneto optical recording materials referenced in the context of general recording materials as being materials

used in the DVD -RAM.

In contrast, claim 19 recites, among other features, that "the optically writing optically writing the input data comprising writing the input data to the DVD without using a magnet." As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 19.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 22 and 25.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: Nov. 13, 2006

By: _____
James G. McEwen
Registration No. 41,983

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to: Commissioner for Trademarks.
on Nov. 13 2006
STEIN, McEWEN & BUI LLP
By: _____
Date: Nov. 13, 2006